



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,853	12/11/2006	Shin-ichi Kuroda	288624US2PCT	4199
22850 7590 03/17/2010 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
CHAN, KAWING				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2837				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/17/2010		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com

oblonpat@oblon.com

jgardner@oblon.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/573,853

**Applicant(s)**

KURODA, SHIN-ICHI

**Examiner**

Kawing Chan

**Art Unit**

2837

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2010.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 4-7 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 4-7 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG-08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The Amendments and Applicant Arguments submitted on 01/29/10 have been received and its contents have been carefully considered. The examiner wishes to thank the Applicant for the response to the Examiner's action and for amending the claims in the appropriate manner.

Claim 3 has been cancelled.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-7 are pending for examination.

### ***Drawings***

2. The objections to the drawings have been removed in response to the Applicant's Amendments.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 01/29/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument with respect to claim 1 "Hamachi does not disclose or suggest that the display of two or more images simultaneously occurs as a result of a user-initiated monitoring request", the examiner disagrees with the argument. As shown in Figure 5, Hamachi discloses more than one elevator basket, and, in paragraph [0032], Hamachi discloses each elevator basket comprises a surveillance camera for monitoring purposes. In paragraph [0050], Hamachi discloses the

monitoring system can display images in each of the elevator baskets in turn or display on a divided screen at the same time based on the search parameter. Since the search parameter is the occurrence time inputted by user (see Paragraph [0037]), Hamachi perfectly discloses a display for displaying two or more images (i.e. images from different elevator baskets) simultaneously (since the images are displayed on a divided screen at the same time, and the images are retrieved based on the inputted time by user, all the images must be synchronized with each other so as to be able to display on the divided screen) occurs as a result of a user-initiated monitoring request (i.e. search parameter).

Applicant further argues that "according to Hamachi, since there is only one camera installed in the elevator car, there is only one image displayed on the supervisory monitor 7b along with the operating condition, when a user selects an elevator to be supervised". According to Hamachi in paragraphs [0032, 0050], Hamachi discloses more than one elevator car installed with camera, and images of all the elevator cars can be displayed on a divided screen at the same time.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamachi (JP 2004-189358 A) in view of Yamanouchi (JP 2003-118967 A) and Spitz et al. (US 2005/0099288 A1).

**In Re claim 1**, Hamachi discloses an elevating machine image supervisory system (Abstract) comprising:

- A plurality of monitoring cameras (installed in each of the elevators) that are separately installed at a plurality of monitoring points, and outputs pieces of image data obtained by taking pictures of conditions of said plurality of monitoring points (Paragraphs [0010, 0050]);
- An image data accumulation device that accumulates individual pieces of image data output from said plurality of monitoring cameras in a time series manner (Paragraphs [0030-0036]); And
- An accumulated image data display device that displays image data accumulated in said image data accumulation device in response to a monitoring request (search parameter) from a user (Paragraphs [0032, 0035, 0037]);
- said image data accumulation device outputs a plurality of pieces of monitoring image data corresponding to said monitoring request to said accumulated image data display device when said monitoring request is generated (Paragraphs [0032, 0035, 0037]);

- said accumulated image data display device discriminates among said plurality of monitoring points (Paragraph [0030]: display control means displays images obtained by every surveillance camera in each elevator basket) installed at the elevator in response to the monitoring request (Paragraph [0037]: search parameter) which includes the elevator to be supervised and one piece of information regarding reproduction start time (i.e. search parameter—the occurrence time at the time of being the time at a certain time of the past), and
- Said accumulated image data display device displays, in response to a plurality of monitoring points and said one piece of information regarding reproduction time included in said monitoring request (Paragraph [0037]), said plurality of pieces of monitoring image data corresponding to said plurality of monitoring points at said time while synchronizing said plurality of pieces of monitoring image data with each other (while image from different cameras are displayed on the same screen at the same time based on the search parameter, the image data are displayed in synch with each other) (Paragraphs [0037, 0048-0051]).

Hamachi fails to disclose said plurality of monitoring points include an entrance of an escalator, an exit of the escalator, or a location between said entrance and said exit, and it also fails to disclose the monitoring request contains reproduction start date information.

However, Yamanouchi discloses the plurality of monitoring points include an entrance of an escalator (Figure 6).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Hamachi with the teachings of Yamanouchi, since it is known in the art to utilize the monitoring camera in an image supervisory system so as to be able to monitor the operation condition of an escalator.

Hamachi and Yamanouchi in combination fail to disclose the monitoring request contains reproduction start date information.

However, Spitz discloses the request contains reproduction start date information (Figure 6; Paragraph [0079]).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Hamachi with the teachings of Spitz, since it is known in the art to utilize reproduction start date information to request image data from the storage device so that user can monitor image at specific date and time as desired.

**In Re claim 2**, Hamachi discloses the plurality of monitoring points include the interior of an elevator car (surveillance camera 9 is installed in each of the elevators) (Paragraphs [0030, 0032]).

**In Re claim 4**, as we have discussed above, Hamachi discloses said accumulated image data display device discriminates among said plurality of monitoring points (Paragraph [0030]: display control means displays images obtained by every

surveillance camera in each elevator basket) installed at the elevator in response to the monitoring request (Paragraph [0037]: search parameter) which includes the elevator to be supervised and one piece of information regarding reproduction start time (i.e. search parameter—the occurrence time at the time of being the time at a certain time of the past), and Spitz discloses the monitoring request includes information regarding start date (Figure 6; Paragraph [0079]). In addition, Yamanouchi further discloses the plurality of monitoring points is installed at the moving walk (Figure 6: an entrance of a moving walk).

**In Re claim 5**, Hamachi discloses said accumulated image data display device includes an operating condition supervisory screen (7a, 7b) that monitors the operating condition of an elevator, and said monitoring points are set on said operating condition supervisory screen (images captured by cameras installed in basket of each elevator are displayed on the screen based upon request) (Paragraphs [0048-0051]). In addition, Spitz discloses the monitoring points are set on said operating condition supervisory screen (Figures 18-19; Paragraphs [0094-0097]).

**In Re claim 6**, Spitz discloses said monitoring request contains refresh rate information (68, 69), and said accumulated image data display device displays said image data based on said refresh rate information (Figure 6; Paragraph [0079]).

**In Re claim 7**, Spitz discloses said display device stops the displaying at a time designated by monitoring request (i.e. user request) (Figure 6; Paragraph [0079]).



***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kawing Chan whose telephone number is (571)270-3909. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Walter Benson can be reached on 571-272-2227. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/K. C./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2837

/Walter Benson/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2837